

**UNITED STATES JUDICIAL PANEL  
on  
MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION**

I hereby certify that this instrument is a true and correct copy of the original on file in my office.  
Attest: Geri M. Smith, Clerk  
U.S. District Court  
Northern District of Ohio  
By: s/R Schumitsh  
Deputy Clerk



**IN RE: DEPUY ORTHOPAEDICS, INC., ASR HIP IMPLANT  
PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION**

MDL No. 2197

**TRANSFER ORDER**

**Before the Panel:** Pursuant to Panel Rule 7.1, plaintiffs in 21 actions listed on Schedule A move to vacate our orders that conditionally transferred their respective actions to MDL No. 2197. Responding defendants<sup>1</sup> appearing in one or more actions oppose the motions to vacate.

After considering all argument of counsel, we find these actions involve common questions of fact with the actions previously transferred to MDL No. 2197, and that transfer will serve the convenience of the parties and witnesses and promote the just and efficient conduct of the litigation. Moreover, transfer is warranted for reasons set out in our order directing centralization. In that order, we held that the Northern District of Ohio was an appropriate Section 1407 forum for actions sharing factual questions arising from alleged injuries from DePuy's recalled ASR XL Acetabular Hip System. *See In re DePuy Orthopaedics, Inc., ASR Hip Implant Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 753 F.Supp.2d 1378 (J.P.M.L. 2010). These actions all involve injuries from implantation of DePuy ASR hip implants, and clearly fall within the MDL's ambit.

None of the plaintiffs dispute that their actions share questions of fact with actions pending in MDL No. 2197. Plaintiffs instead base their arguments against transfer primarily on the pendency of motions to remand their respective actions to state court. Plaintiffs in these actions can present their motions for remand to the transferee judge.<sup>2</sup> *See, e.g., In re Ivy*, 901 F.2d 7 (2nd Cir. 1990); *In re Prudential Ins. Co. of Am. Sales Practices Litig.*, 170 F.Supp.2d 1346, 1347-48 (J.P.M.L. 2001).

---


<sup>1</sup> DePuy Orthopaedics, Inc., and DePuy International Ltd. (collectively DePuy); Johnson & Johnson International, Johnson & Johnson Management Ltd., Johnson & Johnson Medical Ltd., Johnson & Johnson Services, Inc., and Johnson & Johnson; Chesapeake Surgical, Ltd.; William G. Macari and Macari Medical Inc.; Precision Instruments, Inc.; Andy Seaman.

<sup>2</sup> Panel Rule 2.1(d) expressly provides that the pendency of a conditional transfer order does not limit the pretrial jurisdiction of the court in which the subject action is pending. Between the date a remand motion is filed and the date that transfer of the action to the MDL is finalized, a court wishing to rule upon the remand motion generally has adequate time in which to do so.

-2-

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407, these actions are transferred to the Northern District of Ohio and, with the consent of that court, assigned to the Honorable David A. Katz for inclusion in the coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings.

PANEL ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John G. Heyburn II", positioned above a horizontal line.

---

John G. Heyburn II  
Chairman

Kathryn H. Vratil  
Barbara S. Jones  
Marjorie O. Rendell

W. Royal Furgeson, Jr.  
Paul J. Barbadoro  
Charles R. Breyer

**IN RE: DEPUY ORTHOPAEDICS, INC., ASR HIP IMPLANT  
PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION**

MDL No. 2197

**SCHEDULE A**

District of Maryland

Paul K. Wood, II, et al. v. Johnson & Johnson, et al., C.A. No. 1:12-01572  
Doris G. Wynn, et al. v. Johnson & Johnson, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 1:12-01997  
Barbara Benfield v. DePuy Orthopaedics, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 8:12-01601  
Eva MacGregor v. DePuy Orthopaedics, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 8:12-01842

District of Montana

Sue Malletta v. DePuy Orthopaedics, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 9:12-00098

District of Nevada

Sheila I. Glaser v. DePuy Orthopaedics, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:12-00895  
Genevieve H. Lee v. DePuy Orthopaedics, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:12-01164  
Hannelore Von Reichow v. DePuy Orthopaedics, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:12-01165  
Amy E. Mills v. DePuy Orthopaedics, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:12-01166  
Carol K. Tobler, et al. v. DePuy Orthopaedics, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:12-01167  
Kim Pate, et al. v. DePuy Orthopaedics, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:12-01168  
Eileen A. Wiedeman v. DePuy Orthopaedics, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:12-01169  
Palma Shehan v. DePuy Orthopaedics, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:12-01170  
Stephanie Santa Cruz v. DePuy Orthopaedics, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:12-01172  
James N. Caron v. DePuy Orthopaedics, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:12-01173  
Nancy G. Hill, et al. v. DePuy Orthopaedics, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:12-01174  
Bruce Fein, et al. v. DePuy Orthopaedics, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:12-01175  
Jeannette E. Davidson v. DePuy Orthopaedics, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:12-01177  
Kipp H. Greengrass v. DePuy Orthopaedics, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:12-01178  
John A. Lanzillotta v. DePuy Orthopaedics, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 2:12-01179

District of South Carolina

Michelle S. Felkel v. DePuy Orthopaedics, Inc., et al., C.A. No. 3:12-01931